



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The leading decision upholding the instant case thinks it wiser to preserve the constitutional right as to venue, and force the State to a proof of the county in which the alleged crime was committed. "It is no uncommon thing to have criminal prosecutions fail for want of proof, and while the danger of such failure may be greater in this class of cases than in others, it is not made clear to us how a man can be lawfully deprived of a constitutional right for such a reason." *People v. Brock*, 149 Mich. 464, 112 N. W. 1116, 119 Am. St. Rep. 684. Under similar circumstances, the same holding was made in *State v. Anderson*, 191 Mo. 134, 90 S. W. 95. But compare *Steerman v. State*, 10 Mo. 317.

The modern trend seems in favor of this doctrine. In 16 CORPUS JURIS 198, it is stated that the weight of authority is *contra*, but the cases cited do not uphold the text in that contention, as a cursory examination will show.

There is really only one well considered case holding with the view of constitutionality. This case rests on the peculiar phraseology of the Illinois Constitution, and even in it, the court stated the prosecution must be instituted in the county where committed, if that can be discovered, or is disclosed by the accused. *Watt v. People*, 126 Ill. 9, 18 N. E. 340, 1 L. R. A. 403.

If there are no restrictions in the Constitution, then the legislature may surely enact a statute similar to the one under discussion. *State v. Lewis*, 142 N. C. 626, 55 S. E. 600, 9 Ann. Cas. 604, 7 L. R. A. (N. S.) 669.

There is no statute upon this subject in Virginia.

EQUITY—PENALTIES AND FORFEITURES—ENFORCEMENT.—The plaintiff corporation sold and conveyed certain lots to the defendant. As a part of the consideration, the defendant bound herself to erect certain buildings on the land within six months. Should such buildings not be erected in the time specified, it was further agreed that the lots should revert to the plaintiff. The buildings were not erected and the plaintiff filed a bill in equity to annul and rescind the deed, on the ground of the breach of a condition subsequent. The defendant demurred on the ground that the bill prayed for a forfeiture of the title to real estate while there was a complete and adequate remedy at law. *Held*, the bill will not lie. *Pence v. Tidewater Townsite Corporation* (Va.), 103 S. E. 694. See NOTES, p. 306.

INSURANCE—ACCIDENTAL—MURDER IS AN ACCIDENT.—The defendant insurance company issued to the deceased an indemnity policy insuring him "against bodily injuries sustained directly and independently of all other causes through accidental means". The policy also provided that the estate of the insured would receive payment, should an accident happen to the insured resulting in his death. The insured was murdered and his administratrix, the plaintiff, brought an action to recover the insurance. *Held*, the plaintiff may recover. *Buckley v. Mass. Bonding & Ins. Co.* (Wash.), 192 Pac. 924.

An accident has been defined as "an event happening without any